

212/291

as the belt is constricted about the chest by the rotating member.

29. The chest compression device of claim 28 wherein said friction liner is composed of a low-friction material.

30. The chest compression device of claim 28 wherein said friction liner is selected from the group comprised of a belt, a vest, a corset, a girdle, a strap and a band.

---

Remarks

Claims 1 through 30 remain pending in the application.

The office action rejects claims 1 through 15 as anticipated by Lach et al., Resuscitation Method and Apparatus, U.S. Patent No. 4,770,164 (Sep. 13, 1988), under the assertion that Lach teaches a belt 12 and a rotating member 72, and that the shirt worn by the user would appear to comprehend the friction liner.

The problem solved by the friction liner is not anticipated by Lach because the problem does not exist in Lach. Lach admits that there is no substantial rubbing or shearing action on the skin or flesh of the patient due to the interposition of the band-guides 16 and 18, demonstrating that Lach solves the friction problem in an entirely different way. Lach describes the problem of friction and how that problem is solved:

Due to the interposition of the band-guides 16 and 18 there is no substantial rubbing or shearing action on the skin or flesh of the patient covering the posterior side portions 24 and 26 of the thorax 14. There is some frictional engagement of the band 12 with the rear thorax portion 32. This depends on the magnitude of the inwardly-directed force components as at 70 which in turn depend on the location of rollers 28 and 30. In the

212/291

embodiment shown, these rollers are set to minimize force components 70 by being symmetrically located as close as possible to the base 34 while allowing sufficient clearance to thread the plural-thickness band 12 under roller 28. Friction against the rear portion 32 of the thorax can be further reduced by placing a thin sheet of polytetrafluoroethylene resin plastic between the patient and the base 34 and the contoured portions 20 and 22, but this is at present believed to be unnecessary.

(col 6, lines 44 to 62). The shirt drawn on the patient in Lach is not a friction liner since there is no friction problem in the Lach device. The patient in Lach just happened to be wearing a shirt. Furthermore, if the examiner's interpretation were correct, it would require placement of the device over clothing, which is most often not the case. More often than not the shirt of the patient is removed prior to resuscitation so that ECG defibrillation electrodes can be placed on the patient. Therefore, the shirt drawn on the patient in Lach does not comprehend the friction liner in the claimed invention.

Furthermore, the examiner has made a strained interpretation of the reference that could be made only by hindsight. The examiner concludes that the shirt is adapted to be disposed between the belt and the chest of the user, it extends around the chest of the user, permits the belt to slide freely over the shirt, is made of low-friction material and is completely separate from the belt. The examiner's statement does not take into consideration the vastness and variety of potential patients and their particular tastes in clothing. Only the best dressed patients would receive the adequate care. For example, the examiner's reasoning would require that all potential patients wear clothing made of low-friction material, such as Teflon, tyvek or other low-friction material. Patients wearing a rubber

212/291

wetsuit, a flannel shirt, a wool sweater, a pique golf shirt or other high-friction material might be severely abraded or cut were they to be resuscitated with a device lacking the friction liner claimed in the invention. The examiner's conclusion further ignores the interaction of shirt buttons or zippers in the procedure that could snag on the belt. Thus, the addition of a friction liner eliminates all the potential variables which could lead to incidental trauma.

Though the Lach patient may have been drawn with a shirt, Lach did not suggest that the shirt would have acted as a friction liner. The words shirt or clothing do not appear in the Lach patent. Lach expressly teaches a different way of reducing friction. In contrast, the friction liner described and defined by the specification is clearly separate from and additional to any clothing the patient might be wearing.

The examiner has ignored the limitations of the claims. Claims 13 through 15 further require that the friction liner provide a substantially stationary surface for the compression belt to slide over as the belt is constricted about the chest by the rotating member. No statement as to how this limitation is met in the prior art has been given by the examiner. Given typical shirting material, the shirt is likely to be carried by the force of the belt and exacerbate the sawing problem addressed by the friction liner.

The examiner has included two references not relied on in the rejection but both of which teach away from the claimed invention. Byrd et al, Universal Blood-Pressure Cuff Cover, U.S. Patent 5,620,001 (Apr. 15, 1997), teaches a band placed between a blood pressure cuff and the patient's skin. The placing of the soft first layer 28 against the patient's skin enhances the comfort of the patient and resists slippage of the bottom band 12 on the skin surface. (col 4 lines 21-31). The band resists slippage and does not enhance slippage and thus, the reference teaches away from the

212/291

friction liner in the claimed invention. Goldstein et al., Medical Tourniquet Apparatus, U.S. Patent 5,411,518 (May 2, 1995), teaches a pad disposed between the arm of the patient and the tourniquet. The pad is absorbent and is intended to extract fluids away from the skin of the patient. (col 4 lines 16 - 40). Slippage of a tourniquet is clearly undesirable, and the reference as a whole suggests that high friction is desirable. Thus, the reference solves a different problem than the friction liner in the claimed invention. Furthermore, the force exerted in each of these references is applied statically, so that the sawing problem addressed by the applicants' friction liner does not apply.

Finally, the examiner has stated no convincing reason as to why the shirt drawn on the patient in Lach acts as the friction liner in the claimed invention. The examiner has merely stated that the shirt would perform the same function as the friction liner without considering the various types of fabric that might surround a patient, if fabric were even surrounding the patient, and how that fabric would act as a friction liner.

Claims 16 through 30 have been added to clarify that the friction liner is provided in addition to any clothing worn by the human.

#### Conclusion

This response has addressed all of the Examiner's grounds for rejection. The rejections based on prior art have been traversed. Reconsideration of the rejections and allowance of the claims is requested.

Date: March 12, 2003

By: 

Susan L. Crockett, Esq.  
Reg. No. 51,590